171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The House will come to order, Mr. Deering. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Ralph Deming from the First Baptist Church of Sidell. Reverend Deming is the guest of Representative Mike Weaver. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Reverend Deming: "Let us pray. Lord, we thank You for peace and prosperity, the peace and prosperity we have enjoyed even in this world marked by many troubles. Lord, You have told us that the hearts of our Leaders are in Your hands, so we would ask You today that You would guide them as they act on the issues before them, so that we may live peaceful and productive lives. Enable us to serve both You and our fellow man. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Deering."
- Deering et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I have no report of any absences on this side."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."
- Speaker McPike: "Take the record. One hundred seventeen Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Message from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

of Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change, which are attached to the Bill, the following title, the acceptance of which I am instructed to ask concurrence to the House to wit; Senate Bill 1988 and further directed to transmit the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change by the Senate. Action taken by the Senate, November 17, 1992, Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.'"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston. Children and Family
Law. First Reading. A special call, House Resolution 322.

Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I rise in support and would urge your passage of House Resolution 322. House Resolution 322 would urge Congress and I'm joined in this Resolution Representative McAfee and Representative Cronin. House Resolution 322 would urge Congress to introduce to United States Constitution an Amendment which would grant Congress the power to prohibit flag desecration desecration of the United States Flag. At the present time, 28 states have passed this Resolution...Illinois if...would pass this today would become the 29th state. The Senate has passed this Resolution. I would ask if you would support it. All of the veteran groups in our state, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of other veteran groups...are in strong and a number support of this Resolution, and I think that should...understand that a flag is a very important symbol of our country. There are...we are a nation of many nationalities, many religions...many...different ancestry. What binds us together...is that we are a republic. We are

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

a republic and we are...we do not have a common language, we do not have a common ancestry, we do not in some instances have a common land, so what binds us together is the fact that we are a republic and what symbolizes our republic is the United States Flag, and I think it's an important symbol, I think it's a symbol that...should be protected, and I would call upon all of you to support this Resolution, and Mr. Speaker, I would ask Representative McAfee...would...be allowed to close on this Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I can understand the kinds of concerns that generate a Resolution like this, patriotism and anxiety about lack of respect, but let's pause a minute and think about the symbolism. One of the marvelous things about this great country of ours is the ability to protest and to object. The desecration of the flag is not the desecration of the government, it is not the desecration of individuals or assassinations. It is using a piece of cloth as a symbol, I recognize that there's going to be objections to this. Don't shake your fist at me, Sir. I am standing in the Forum of the House of Representatives of Illinois, and I shall speak."

Speaker McPike: "And if there are...and if there are any interruptions from the gallery, we will clear the gallery.

We do not allow demonstrations in this Body.

Representative Stern has the floor."

Stern: "I respect the gentleman in the gallery who cares so strongly about protecting the flag. I respect the sentiment that burns in your breast, it burns in mine also, but I do resent the effort to intimidate me as I speak to you about the Constitution of these United States, which

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

you fought to protect, which I care about protecting here today. I do not expect to be successful, but I think it is important that we mention the fact that the Constitution protects this kind of protest. I shall vote 'no'. I shall probably not be joined by very many of my colleagues, but I hope you will pause to think a little bit about the kind of thing we are saying to the world when we pass legislation prohibiting this kind of protest. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Martinez."

Martinez: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As...as Chair of Veterans Committee here in...in the House of Representatives, I stand wholeheartedly in favor of this Motion, the Gentleman's Motion. I've...I've had much contact from different veterans organizations, and I think I speak for them. Personally I...I have a bad distaste for people that would do something to our flag and it's an insult to all...all veterans, and I urge this Body to give this Motion an overwhelming vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAfee to close."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I urge the...General Assembly here this morning, this afternoon to adopt this Resolution urging Congress to adopt this Constitutional Amendment. I question no one's patriotism or love of the flag or love of the country, regardless of their support or their opposition. I think that anyone here in this General Assembly has the sincerity of their views and should be respected for that. However, the First Amendment rights in my opinion are not limitless. There are limits to freedom of expression. No one can call out in a crowded theater for fire when no fire exists, and no one can speak up and incite a riot when none is called for. I think those who

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

look to this and we start every day in this chamber with the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag, it's more than a symbol, it's a belief. Therefore, I urge this Body to adopt this Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 322. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it...the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Page 7 of the Calendar, Total Veto Motions. There's House Bill 1129, Representative Ropp. Mr. Ropp."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ropp: Bill 1129 is a Bill that is attempting to establish a trust fund that has been derived by registration fees motorcycle owners. The purpose of that fund is solely designated for the training and helping teach people who own motorcycles how to drive them safely. For the purpose of safety on the highway and safety of the individual owns that motorcycle, I urge your support in establishing this procedure so that we can maintain dollars improving the safety of motorcycle drivers. I might add that in just the last week or two, we have passed 100,000motorcycle riders safety. The last one being a young lady policeman from the City of Chicago, I am pleased to endorse this Bill and hope for your support in overriding the Governor's Veto. I ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion. Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield briefly?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative Ropp, can you give us an idea who supports this Resolution? Your Motion to override."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Ropp: "Well, all the motorcycle owners and operators, manufacturers and dealers in the State of Illinois are in support of this particular Bill as well as all the people that own motorcycles."

Weaver: "There's...there's a group called...ABATE. Where do they stand on this Motion?"

Ropp: "They are very much in support of this."

Weaver: "Very much in support?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Weaver: "...And lastly, where is DOT on this...Motion?"

Ropp: "To my knowledge,...I think they're pretty neutral right now because they think there's a lot of support on this Bill."

Weaver: "Okay, so as you understand at this point, there's no objection to your Motion to override?"

Ropp: "Correct."

Weaver: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Klemm."

Klemm: Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question? Thank you.

Representative, are these funds from the state monies or are these contributions or fees that the motorist or motorcyclist contributes into this fund?"

Ropp: "They are registration fees paid only by the motorcycle owners as well as potentially contributions that may be put into this fund by let's say, manufacturers or dealers in a continuing effort to help safety be operated on motorcycles."

Klemm: "All right, so actually no state funds were involved other than...it seemed to me a couple of years ago, didn't the fees...weren't the fees raised to help...for this safety training program?"

Ropp: "Yes."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Klemm: "That was a voluntary request by the motorcyclist themselves to help finance and fund this very program.

Isn't that right?"

Ropp: "That is correct. We're not restoring or taking away any dollars, we're just maintaining those dollars that these individuals have put into this program as registration fees to register the motorcycle."

Klemm: "All right, well...well thank you, and Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I certainly...seems as if this is a Bill that needs and deserves our support because it seems as if the very industry and the very persons involved in this fee that are paying for it who would ask for this and are voluntarily if you will, contributing, going to a training program certainly seems like we should continue that obligation and that promise if you will, so I stand in support of the Gentleman's Bill and ask for you to join with us."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Assembly, if we could just have your attention for a moment. This is a very, very important veto. What is going to happen if this is successful in overriding the Governor's Veto is that your taking oversight from the General Assembly away entirely. So DOT, other agencies involved can collect the federal dollars, other dollars, place them in this fund and you, the future Members of this General Assembly, will not have any oversight. I ask you, do not allow this veto to be overridden. You are setting a precedent that will come back to haunt you in the days and years to come. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, yes...I echo...Representative McGann's remarks because...although the Bill states that the funds

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

shall be out of the State Treasury...although I don't have a copy of the Bill in front of me, both the Synopsis and the Governor's Message indicates that DOT has the authority to accept federal, state or private monies. In other words, federal or state monies may be in this fund. long as there are state monies in this fund, there is no reason why we...we, meaning the General Assembly, shall not have that oversight authority. This is a terrible precedent. What you are saying is taxpayers funds do not have to be a matter of oversight by the legislative That's wrong, wrong, and I don't care what the process. organization is, I don't care what political clout organization might have, it is wrong to provide that state funds shall not be a matter of oversight by the Legislature and I would urge a...an opposition of this Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Message and if I could just read a couple of sentences than I....I'd like to ask you for a comment about that. He said that the Bill would allow DOT to use the funds without any oversight on the part of the Governor or the General Assembly. Then he goes on to say that this sets a poor precedent for special state funds and dedicated funds neither the Governor or the General Assembly would be guarantee of maintaining control over the operation of state government. I think...I don't think anybody on this...in this floor has a problem with the program that's provided for in this...this legislation, but what is the rationale for excluding both Gubernatorial and General Assembly oversight. ...Why don't we....we generally go in

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

the other direction. In terms of federal funding, we wanted to make sure that the General Assembly had Appropriations authority over all federal funds...you know... Is there...is there anything you can't accomplish in terms of this program without having the General Assembly and the Governor have the kind of traditional oversight in the Appropriation authority....that we've had for years and years?"

"Mr. Representative, let me respond. First of all, Ropp: these monies are strictly registration fees contributed by the individuals who own the motorcycles, as well as what we are attempting to do, allow private business who contribute because they understand the importance of good training on how to ride and operate a motorcycle safely. What some of the Body chooses to do is to mandate that people must use helmets, for example, for safety purposes. We are hoping that through the process of education and training on sight that many universities throughout State of Illinois, that we are able to teach to those people who own motorcycles so that they, in fact, will in a position to drive safely. The problem that we have had in the past on this particular issue is that from time to time, these funds that have been so designated by this Body, have been borrowed from, thus restricting the number of people who own motorcycles that option to learn how to drive them safely after they purchase one. We feel that the safety that is instructed for those people who want to own and operate motorcycles in the State of Illinois is of uppermost important and that privilege and opportunity to learn how to drive them safely should not be denied them because someone chooses to take the money from that option that they have given. If you want to have mandatory helmet

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

laws, then you will probably want to oppose this. I say, it is far better to educate and train..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative...Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "...people, rather than to mandate what they ought to do and ought to not do just because they own a motorcycle.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you need to support..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp. It's the Chair's understanding that you're answering Mr. Levin's question?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Hum...Well, I thought you were giving a closing argument, but..."

Ropp: "No, not yet. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, well that was very close."

Ropp: "Pretty close."

Speaker McPike: "Uh-huh. Mr. Levin, did he answer your question?"

Levin: "...He went well beyond that to answer my question, but..."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Levin: ".... appreciated what he said. I..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin, you have the floor now."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that all of the concerns that the Gentleman had, you know, can be done through the normal process of oversight. We just went through a General Election in which the people spoke. They decided we...we have a Democratic process and they did not like some of the votes that incumbents cast and they threw those out, those individuals out. We have a process where the people make the decisions and they expect their elected officials to have responsibility after they have spoken for

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

process oversight over the governmental and the appropriations process. You know, I think this runs counter to that. We also had a Constitutional Amendment that would have mandated how this Legislature spends money in terms of education. People thought that that was inappropriate. They felt that it belonged to this General Assembly to make that decision. I think again....I this runs counter to that as well, so I think we need to keep the process we have. I think the basic program good program, but we don't need to take away the authority of both the Governor and the General Assembly."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. Let us not...cloud the issue anymore than it's already been clouded. This does not involve state funds, it does involve general revenue funds. This is simply a pro-active response to what a vast majority of the Electorate said on an advisory referendum on November 3rd, that they're sick and tired of mandates. What this Bill before you does, in all honesty, is pro-actively tell the federal government; we're sick and tired of you mandating to us what we will do with the road fund money that you returned to us, and they are saying that if you don't pass a mandatory helmet we're going to divert a percentage of your road fund money into traffic safety classes. Well alright, if that's what want to do, this Bill is trying to accommodate them. We're raising the cap and say we're simply going to more of that money that the federal government blackmailing us with into motorcycle safety That's all it does. It doesn't take anybody's money from anybody's project. There's no general revenue dollars

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

involved here. This is a simple pro-active response to another piece of heavy-handed federal mandate and blackmail. Sweet and simple. It deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Parcells: "I have just one question, and that would be would these funds be audited by the Auditor General?"

Ropp: "Absolutely."

Parcells: "Alright, that was a concern of mine that they would get out of the circuit and suddenly we would have no control, but I support the Bill if they were...audited by the Auditor General."

Ropp: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In brief closing, the people who own motorcycles have made a decision. They are willing to pay registration fees in order to receive the training in order that people can ride these vehicles safely, to learn how to wear helmets rather than to be mandated that they should. I think it is far better to let the people make that decision and your favorable vote in supporting this override will be most appreciated. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1129 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 89 'ayes' and 21 'noes'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, is adopted and this Bill is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Novak

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

in the Chair."

Novak: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to have your attention, please. It's...a great honor to have...have these young gentlemen here today. I would like to introduce to you the 1992 Champion... State Champion Golf from Bishop McNamara High School in Kankakee. young gentlemen are fine golfers. They worked hard the last couple of years. I think they came in second last year. They came in first this year for the statewide trophy, and I know we...we have a lot of avid golfers, or would be golfers in the...Legislature, so I'm sure they'll be here for a few...a few training sessions, probably for a fee of course, but...they are excellent golfers and I'd like to introduce...their coach, Mike McGuckin from Bishop McNamara High School. Mike's...Mike's brother Pat is the Senate Democratic Staff and Mike, I'd like for you to introduce our players."

McGuckin: "Thanks, Bill. From...on my left, Mr. Andy Basten, Mr. Chad Gesner, Mr. Joe Blanchet, Mr. Brad White, Mr. Tony Hartman, Mr. Mike Edwards, and Mr. Tim Sheehan."

Novak: "Thank you very much for your time and...gentlemen, good luck in the future."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 2016."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask...for the...Body to..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you. I ask the Body to override the Governor's Veto withstanding on House Bill 2016. I may remind the Body that it's passed the chamber at a 114 to 0, and basically the Governor's concern was on notification. He felt that there wasn't good enough notification in the Bill, but quite frankly, there is good notification and I

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

think he....misunderstood what this Bill does, and in essence that notification will be put on the Bill when it becomes 60 days in arrears on their payment, and that it'll be printed just like...infor....any other information that goes on a Bill says that if he's beyond 60 days in delinquency that the lender has the right to raise his rates from whatever the prevailing rate is on that person up 5 percentage points, or whatever way we can encourage person who's delinquent to pay those bills. essence, what we're trying to do is make sure that the good consumer, the people that pay their bills on time, eventually if don't we have the deadbeat paying....not paying their bills that we can in fact lower rates on the credit cards. But right now, as we're aware, when we have all these people who may not be paying bills on time, the rest of us, the ones that pay our bills on time will have to...take and...pay a higher rate to offset those losses. We think this is a good idea whose time has come, and I would ask the Body to...pass override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 2016."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition of the Gentleman's Motion and urge you to uphold the Governor's Veto. While the...while the Sponsor of the Motion is certainly well intended, I think we should concentrate on, in fact, what the Governor said in his Veto Message. While the Sponsor tried to address this, I find nothing in the language of the Bill that contradicts the Governor's Veto Message, that says simply; this Bill would allow a retroactive raising of rates to revolving credit card borrowers, while I, the Governor am mindful of a lender's needs to discourage

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

delinquent borrowers, unilateral increases in interest rates without ratification by the borrower, raises serious concerns of fairness. The rewarding of good customers by lowering rates is a laudable practice, but is already allowed under existing law. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you vote to override the Governor's Veto of this Bill, you are putting consumers in your district at risk who have entered into a financial contract at a supposed interest rate and then they turn around and find out that because of their past history or a capricious action by the lender, their interest rates will, in fact, be increased without their knowledge and or prior constructive notice. I urge you in the fairness to consumers to uphold the Governor's Veto on this Bill, vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke, to close."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate the Floor Leader's comments about this Bill, but let me just remind you, we are only talking about 4% of the people who do not find that they're paying their bills. And quite frankly, the rest of us end up paying higher premiums on our interest on our credit cards because of that. Now, I'm...I'm also condescend that...that...some people may be affected by this, but you know, lenders are not interested in in...getting more money, what they're interested in is...."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me just a minute, Mr. Parke. Excuse me."

Parke: "....is getting the money that they have loaned back..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Parke, excuse me. Excuse me, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "...from these people, and they're willing to work with those people, but when we put it in writing and put it on their bill that they could...when their arrears for after

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

60 days that their rates could be raised, I think that we are letting everybody know that we're serious that we want you to pay back those bills like everybody else does. And I think this is a good idea, and I would ask the Body to...agree with me and override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak. Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have everyone's attention. You know we have....we are at a very auspicious moment in the history of the Illinois General Assembly. I would like to welcome Representative Kurt Granberg to the chambers."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg. Mr. Parke, did you finish? Mr. Parke, did you finish?"

Parke: "Yes, Sir, I did."

Speaker McPike: "All right."

Parke: "I would ask the Body to...agree with me and override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "All right, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2016 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? All right, the Clerk will the...the Clerk will take the record. Let's see. Mr. Parliamentarian, how many votes does this Motion require? Mr. Parke, it's 71. It requires 71 on this. Seventy-one. Seventy-one. So, that...on this, Mr. Clerk, take record. On this Motion there are...l 'aye', l 'aye'...there's...there's just 1 'aye' on this. Mr. Matijevich...."

Matijevich: "I wanted to correct you. You said, 'There are', then you said, 'l ayes'."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Yeah, I...I know."

Matijevich: "There is 1 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "There is 1 'aye'. There is 1 'aye'. It's difficult to say there are...there are...you know. On this Motion there is 1 'aye' and there are 108 'noes'. This Motion...having....having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Parke, you can file that Motion again if you wish. House Bill 2697, Representative Edley. Out of the record. House Bill 2954, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Representative Novak, House Bill 2996."

Novak: "Yes, yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that we override the Governor's Total Veto of House Bill 2996. This Bill...this past Session was discussed in detail. It seeks to restore the double delayed school aid payment that occurred Senate Bill 45 in July 18 of 1991. If you talk to your school district...principals...and administrators around the state in your respective areas, they did get delayed payment. It was delayed, but it was past our fiscal year, so they're constantly trying to catch up with this other payment. It means a loss of \$176,000,000 to schools downstate and the Bill seeks for...gives the authority to the Governor to...borrow the money at a much lower interest rate that what would occur had our local school districts be forced to borrow the money at probably a much higher interest rate. So I ask for your support in the Motion to override this Total Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund, on the Motion."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I met with Director Whitley this morning regarding this issue, and it's absolutely a fact that no money is being deprived of any school district in Illinois as a

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

result of this double payment in June. All school districts in Illinois operate on a July 1 date. This merely moves the payment of \$176,000,000 from June to July which could be a...a matter of two days and depending whether a school district is operating with a deficit, receiving that double payment in June and paying last year's expenses or they're going to use it in July because their new fiscal year starts, to start paying their year's expenses. No school district in this state has lost any money as a result of this, it merely delayed the payment for one month. The state is not in a position to make that double payment during its fiscal year which ends on June 30th. It merely delays it, it does not eliminate it, and it will be made up. Now I know it sounds like a...a tough vote, like depriving school children of dollars they need to be educated, but the fact of the matter is, is that they are not losing any dollars. It's as simple that. Director Whitley assures me that that's the case. I've studied the issue. School districts in this state are not losing a single dollar under this Bill, it merely delays the payment from June to July and it makes a lot of sense when you stop and think about it because the 176 million, the double payment is to start the next year fiscal year and in fact, it will come during the first month of the fiscal year of school districts in this state which start July 1. So the Governor's Veto was necessary because of the fiscal year of the state which ends on June 30th, merely pushing those dollars over into July for next fiscal year, which is the start of the school year for all school districts in Illinois. The Governor's Veto should be sustained in this instance and keep the state $% \left(n\right) =\left(n\right) ^{2}$ a fiscally sound footing. We don't know what the revenue

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

projections are going to be for the next fiscal year and we won't know them for a long time to come until next Session beginning in January. To keep this state on a sound fiscal footing, it is absolutely necessary, and I heard arguments from both sides of the aisle, and particularly the other side of the aisle during this last Session of the General Assembly, that the State of Illinois must be fiscally conservative in these tight economic times. You should live up to those expectations and those statements that you and I both made that we've got to make Illinois fiscally sound and fiscally conservative and keep it with a balanced budget. That's why a 'no' vote is the correct vote on this issue."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I listened to a...of this balanced budget fiscal responsibility baloney just about What...what you're doing here is, by voting long enough. is...giving an okay for more smoke and mirrors budgetary that has gotten in...the state into the situation where we have the highest lapse period spending, the most money being spent out of...this year's revenue to pay for last year's bills. A 'yes' vote is a vote for fiscal responsibility. It's a vote that says the \$176,000,000 has to be paid within a...within a two week period of time. We should pay it in the fiscal year in which we collect the revenue, not...delaying it in...for a...a couple of weeks into the...the next fiscal year. That's a classic smoke and mirror budgeting trick. We've got to stop it. A 'yes' vote here will send a clear message that the State of Illinois is going to get back on the track and act in a more...businesslike fashion."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would remind my colleagues House Bill 600 sponsored by Governor approved Representative Curran, Weller, Novak, Rotello and Deering, which provides that the State Superintendent of Education shall compensate school districts for any interest lost as a result of the change in the state aid payments in June and July. That was already approved by the Governor. Bill was not and for, it seems to me, excellent reasons. The Governor referred to the provisions of House Bill 2996 as hocus-pocus language that is a product of political posturing and fiscal fecklessness. He said the Bill which would require the state to borrow at least a \$130,000,000 but would not put one more dime into any Illinois classroom was supported by Legislators for re-election purposes only. According to the Governor, approval of this Bill would send terrible message to the financial markets that play a major role in determining the cost to Illinois taxpayers of the state's long range capital program and would also send the wrong message to the Chicago school system by requiring that state aid to that district be accelerated every year, regardless of whether the Chicago school district has it's fiscal house in order and regardless of the condition of the State Treasury. I am in accord with the Governor's views of this Bill, and I believe that any potential problem was already solved by Representative Curran's Bill, which the Governor signed into law. For those reasons, all of which I regard as valid, I stand in opposition to this Override Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

of the House. I think it's very important that you concentrate on one of the issues that has not been widely discussed. The previous speaker mentioned it...and in the hubbub of the House, I'm not sure very many of you heard This Bill, if passed over the Governor's Veto, will require that the state aid payment to Chicago public schools be accelerated every year. Every year, the state aid payment will be accelerated to the Chicago public schools. No one would like to vote for the underlying Bill anymore than I would, but the election is over. There is no money in the Treasury to accelerate this payment, you know that and I know that. I would suggest that we put this issue to bed, uphold the Veto and then let's see if we can work on both sides of the aisle when we come back here 1993, and let's try to make education funding the true priority that we can in the budgetary process. truly, in all due respect to the Sponsor, and I would like to vote for the Bill, particularly if the acceleration was not made a permanent part of the law, but the fact is, and Representative Novak, you know as well as I, the money isn't there to accelerate this payment. I will work with you as you and I worked on the education Amendment together, and we almost got that passed. I would suggest that we no longer posture on this Bill, which is truly a hocus-pocus Bill when we get right down to it, that you and I make our efforts next spring in making education funding the true priority of the state budget. If we pass this, then you're going to have to tell me where we that extra \$176,000,000 to accelerate a month's worth of school aid payments when we don't have the \$176,000,000 in the Treasury, which means we simply start the next budget year another \$176,000,000 behind. The election is over.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

This issue was important at the time, but the money isn't there. It doesn't really do what it says it's going to do and it mandates an accelerated payment to the Chicago public schools, add in for item. For that reason and others, I urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak to close."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I've...I've heard these arguments, this thing in got...and got 90 some odd votes last year. Many Republicans from downstate and from suburban areas supported this Bill as well as Legislators from downstate and the City of Chicago You know, we simply...what we're supported this Bill. trying to do is right a wrong that was committed on the school children in Illinois in 1991. Now if the Governor's Office said nobody lost any money, why are they against the Bill? We're going to go out and borrow the money, the Governor's Office borrowed \$300,000,000 a few months ago to pay some bills off in a timely manner. We've done it previous times before. We have the authority as this Bill does, it gives it the authority under the Casual Deficit Act. We have to put this payment schedule back where it You've heard from your school people, you've heard from teachers, you've heard from parents, you've heard from the school administrators what this delayed and I put that in quotes 'delayed school aid payment' perpetrated upon the school districts of Illinois. We have to right this wrong. You know that and we know that, and we have to put this back on the schedule that it was prior to the enactment of Senate Bill 45. I ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2996 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Laurino. Turn off his light. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "An inquiry of the Chair, please."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "Do we need 71 votes on this?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "In the event that it gets 71, we request a verification."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 69 'ayes' and 42 'noes'. This Motion, having failed to receive a Three-Fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Leitch, would you come to the podium, please. Representative LeFlore, on House Bill 3032."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thirty thirty-two is no stranger around this...chamber and this Bill deals with buy American. And of course, I...it passed both chambers, sent...was sent to the Governor and he vetoed, so I'm coming back to ask you to support me on this round and so we can get it back...hopefully we can override the veto itself. I need a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If all the Members would reflect back on the conversations on...that took place on this House floor and all those who spoke during this last Session of the General Assembly about fiscal restraint about not spending money we don't have. This Bill is estimated to cost between 2 and 5 million dollars a year to the State of Illinois, and that's \$5,000,000 the State of Illinois does not have. And what you're going to do is, if you vote for this Bill, the

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

bottom line is you're going to drive jobs out of Illinois. Not only is the Bill extremely difficult to administer, but many Illinois manufacturers utilize foreign made components in products made by Illinois workers. One classic example is Caterpillar. To close one market to them, the state and local governments would jeopardize the profits of hundreds of Illinois corporations, and put at risk thousands of jobs in Illinois and remove the competit...competitiveness of Illinois industries in being able to furnish goods and services to the State of Illinois and local governments. In times of fiscal restraint, which this state is, is not the time to spend an additional \$5,000,000 and limit the competitiveness of Illinois businesses. This is achieved when a Bill like this Bill authorizes and even encourages paying higher than necessary prices for goods and incurring additional administrative costs to determine the origin of state and local government. The Bill is vague on how to determine what is domestic content, that rises up to 70%, in the high 90's. Illinois ranks 9th among the 50 states in the value of all goods exported to other countries. So if you pass this Bill, what you're going to do is, is you're going to get retaliation, you're going to get retaliation from other companies against That is not good for the business Illinois businesses. atmosphere in this state, that's going to cost jobs if this Bill passes. That's why the Governor vetoed it, vote is the correct vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have debated this Bill in one form or another for any number of...ses...any number of Sessions and...I think the arguments are pretty well known on both sides.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Let me just repeat one of the arguments which has been made, which I think is really a very valid argument, is that Illinois manufacturers and Illinois companies use foreign made components in products which are made Illinois workers. In other words, those manufacturers might buy their...their component part to whatever it is, a car or an auto...or a refrigerator or anything else they make this state, they might buy those parts from within If they do, we are closing the market of the Illinois and local governments to those State of manufacturers to sell their products. Who's that going to hurt? That's going to hurt Illinois workers. That's going to hurt people who are employed by Illinois the manufacturers, it's going to hurt them because those manufacturers are denied a major market to which to sell their products. So there's a lot of ramifications to this Bill, which are somewhat subtle, but have a big impact. I ask that you...you consider those before simply overriding this Veto. I think the proper course of action is to sustain the Governor's Veto...and...and not pass this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Well yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. And I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. If...unless...you know...I..I guess some people weren't paying attention on November 3rd when we had a general election. And we elected a President on the idea that he was going to bring jobs back to this country and to this state. That was the whole message that the Democratic nominee, Bill Clinton, had, and that's why he won the election, and that's what this Bill is about. It's about trying to provide jobs for American workers. That's really

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

what it boils down to. Now doesn't it make sense for us as Illinois citizens and people who make decisions in this Body to say that we want to spend our taxpayer's dollars on That we would rather pay people to build Illinois jobs. these products in Illinois or at least in America, rather than to send this money overseas. You know, even George Bush, the free trader, is in a trade war position with Europe because they won't give us free trade. You know, we said all along that if we're going to fight the Communists we had to be tough. Well we were tough and we won, but if we're going to win any of these wars on free trade, we're going to have to be tough with these folks from Europe and Asia. We're going to have to stand up to them and let them know that we want fair trade. We don't want it going just overseas to them, we want our fair share too. that we have to take a stand here and say yes or no whether we want jobs for Americans, whether we want jobs for Illinoisans or whether we want to simply send our money overseas and I say, I want jobs for Americans and Illinoisans and vote 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3032 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Klemm, to explain his vote."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, the reason I want to explain my vote is because when this Bill came up earlier in Session, I went back to my factory and I looked through the purchasing records and I looked at...at one product that we purchased. Now as many of you know, I'm the only manufacturer in the General Assembly, so a Bill like this certainly would affect people like me and, I looked at it and I found that one component we had, had about seven

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

different sub components that were made by a foreign producers with American people and they were assembled in the United States, in fact, in the State of Illinois because it was an Illinois manufacturer who supplied that very product to me. And I was trying to determine what percent of that product became American or what percent became foreign and I really didn't know what it came out to And then when I called the manufacturer to ask them, 'How did you get this?'. They said, 'Well, we ended up having an expansion. We have grown because we is...ended up increasing our sales and we ended up hiring more people.' So in the long run when you look at some of this restrictive type of approach, we found out that, in fact, we had job creation in a free competitive market situation, and I really am concerned that we don't allow the business community with their workers to solve our problems, more so than trying to put restrictive regulations, thinking it's It doesn't, because when you go to the going to work. foreign countries, they are looking at what we do and certainly will do the same thing. So I would certainly ask you not to override this Veto. It does not work in the real world of industry and I would ask your 'no' vote, and I do ask, Mr. Speaker, for a verification if it does receive the required vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would certainly think that the business community would want this legislation passed because it would bring those dollars home. I think our President won his election because he talked about starting the economy in this country, and we should be concerned with the economy in the State of Illinois. We...we need to look at what it means when everything we consider

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

purchasing comes from foreign soil. That means that the people who live in Illinois are not working, it means that people that live downstate are not working. This is part of the reason that we are having all of the problems we're having here today with employment, because we're not sensible enough to recognize that our dollars should be spent on products bought and made in the State of...United State of America and also in the State of Illinois. I am appalled, I am truly appalled that after this election recently, some people still don't get it. Some people still don't recognize that the economy is one of the number one issues that we're here for and this Bill is to give more jobs to the people in the State of Illinois and to make sure products are made right here."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 69 'ayes' and 40 'noes'. This Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby de....Mr. LeFlore? All right, Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees. Poll those not voting."
- Clerk McLennand: "Representative Black. Kubik. Kulas. Levin.

 McAuliffe. McGann, and Weaver."
- Speaker McPike: "Kubik votes 'no'. Mr. Black votes 'no'. Any others? On this Motion, there are 69 'ayes' and 42 'noes' and this Motion...Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3563, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3563 is the Motor Voter Bill...and I'm sure you have all read...and talked over a good deal about this...veto and override. Let me site a couple of things for you that concern me. First of all, since we passed this Bill in June we have

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

elected a new President of the United States. Voter Bill at the federal level passed the House and Senate I have every reason to believe we are going to have it again under President Clinton and I think it will The Federal Bill is guite different from this signed. Illinois Bill. It includes things like voter registration by mail which happens to be a great favorite of mine, but I don't...I don't know that Illinois is ready registration by mail. It includes a number of other things that we might find onerous. Let's pass our own Bill which was designed for Illinois, and which actually places a very obligation upon the drivers license examining stations in Illinois. What it does, is change the present plan when an individual comes in to reg...to...apply for a drivers license or change his address, he may be asked, the present time, if he wishes to register to vote. This Bill would add simply that he must be asked if he would like to register to vote. Now as a former county clerk, I can tell you that this would alleviate enormously, the work of the county clerks throughout the state. It would level off the activity of voter registration, so instead of having a low number all through the months until the month ele...election, at which time, it before the precipitously rise, this instead would level it off, so we would be able to handle it and accommodate it reasonably. The Secretary of State has said that this would add considerably to the amount he would have to put into his budget. I would like to make the point that if it is the only Secretary of State that would find it necessary to do that. In Arizona where Motor Voter has been the...the policy, no additional persons have been hired. In Colorado, no additional persons have been hired.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

In the District of Columbia, no additional persons have been hired, and I could go on, but there is one more point think is very important for you to know. Governor's Veto Message, he makes the point that there indication that how we register to vote affects the participation in an election. Well, we have those figures which prove that, in fact, that is not the case, it does affect it. In states where Motor Voter has been the...the law, there are nine of them, the percentage increase in activity in this November 1992 election, ranges from 8% to 46%. I want you to think about that. The rest the nation, it is only at 5.5%. There is real indication that if you make voter registration easy for people, accessible, available for people and make it part of...part of their daily...communion with their communities if you will, that they will then go and vote in elections. will watch political activities, they will pay attention to what is going on, and they will participate. I think there is every reason to vote 'aye' on this Override Motion and I ask you to do so."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It would be inexcusable not to support this measure for the simple reason that the cost benefit to government is simply exceeds any of the arguments, which I think are specious arguments, against it. There are so many people who are at the Secretary of State's Office who could be providing a multitude of services and at the same time, empowering people to vote. It was wrong that people could not avail of this service before this election. At the very least we owe it to people now. We're also concerned about the cost of government, to support this measure and

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

let's get it signed and let's get it into action. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm amazed at how short some people's memories are on the other side of the aisle. want to listen to what the registered voters who voted just told you on November the 3rd, by one of the most lopsided majorities ever recorded in the history of this state, what did they tell you? No more unfunded mandates, and here we go. Two weeks after the election, the County Clerk of Cook estimates the start up cost of this program at \$395,000 and out year costs exceeding a quarter of a million dollars. There is no money in the budget for SOS anybody else to implement this program. You can't hire additional staff to take care of the approximate 800,000 people who would be able to take advantage of this under the program, so the lines would be 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 times longer than they are now, particularly in Cook County where you only have 22 drivers license stations. Make no mistake about this Bill. The Secretary of State wants to work with you and all Members of this Body to increase the opportunity to register to vote, but you, under this Bill, require mandate that those people in the drivers license station ask each and every person who comes into that facility as to whether or not they would like to register to vote. That's almost four million people a year come into these facilities, and they would be mandated to ask if they would like to register and then register them. Sounds like a great idea. I don't think anybody's opposed to the concept, but as County Clerk Orr has said, there is a cost to this. You can't...surely you're not going to

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

expect the Cook...Cook County to absorb this cost. The Secretary of State has made it very clear he doesn't have the \$1.8 million. We didn't appropriate the money in his budget to take care of the cost. The voters just told you by a 85% majority, if you're gonna mandate things like this, send the money. We don't have the money, there is no companion Appropriation Bill, and until I see the money to implement this Motor Voter Bill, I suggest to you, a 'no' vote is appropriate, because you can't do the service if you don't have the dollars. Vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this Bill...its time has come. You know, we talk about people not having...not getting involved in political process, that this...this provision and this law has worked in other states. It's very successful, very low overhead. It simply takes a few minutes to register a person to vote. You can't... I can not think of a better place because all the traffic, all the people that come and go in a Secretary of State's drivers facility. We all know it takes eight...you have to be eighteen to...vote in this...this country, and even though kids that come in when they are sixteen, they get their drivers licenses. Some people that come and get their drivers license renewed or turn eighteen and thereafter, need to be registered The young people in our country do not vote as much as we would like to have them vote. The election results of 1992 finally turned that around. More younger people in the age group of 18 to 25 voted than ever before in previous presidential elections. Since 1960 we finally reversed that trend, and I think this Bill, should it become law, will be able to facilitate the opportunities

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

for people to vote, to make it easier for people to vote and I ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "If they trust Perot gave us 3 billion dollars to fund this thing, I would still be against it. All sanctimonious hype, you would think the problem with America is people don't have an opportunity to vote. me a break. E.x.c.u.s.e me. That is not the problem my friends. In my precinct 91% of the registered voters voted, and not one of them didn't vote or didn't register because it was so darn difficult. The reason so many people don't vote in America is because it's a free country. In Russia, in the Soviet Union, 99.9% of the people voted. The reason young people don't vote because they don't care about government, because it does not yet intrude upon their lives. That is a blessing, that is a virtue. Saying 'no' in a free country is what it all about, so get off the soapbox. Sit down and let's put it to rest."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle got all those figures. I heard one say a...a million six, another one said 360 thousand. Fifteen states in our country are doing this already. Fifteen other states, and the only thing it's gonna cost us, in this state, is the postage to send the registration cards back. You're talking \$36,000. Thirty six thousand dollars to send the registration back. And wouldn't it be nice for our Secretary of State's workers in those facilities to ask the person when they come in, 'Are you registered?' Here's an opportunity to register when...when you get your drivers

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

license or whether you get it renewed or whatever you have to. So many people move, like from the city they come to the suburbs in my district and a lot of them feel that they don't have to register again. Wouldn't it be nice for the Secretary of State's Office, with George Ryan's name hanging in the background there, to remind them that they should re-register the new registered should vote? Think about it. We're talking...we're not talking big money, we're just giving everybody the opportunity to register so they can participate. If you look in some of the places where the turnout, because of the registration has been increased, over 15...20% increase in voter participation. Isn't that what it's all about? Think it over Ladies and Gentlemen. Give it an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Now, Mr. Electrician, let's try Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm gonna take a bit of a different path on this particular Bill. If you look at the figures that the Secretary of State's Office provided to us in a letter that they recently sent out, after...in September there was a 400% increase in voter registration at the facility. Clearly, it is working on a volunteer basis, so it's not as though we're not doing this right now, we are doing it. We're doing it on a voluntary basis and it's working. It's working right now, so why is it that this Legislature or any Legislature must rush to mandate something that is all ready working, so I would ask you to consider the...the We're doing the job now, it doesn't make sense to cost. mandate it, let's hold the line on expenses and let's oppose this Override Motion and kill this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern to close."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

- Stern: "Mr. Speaker, if I may close, I... I want to...counter some of the things that have been said. First of all, this is a slightly different implementation of Motor Voter than we had contemplated in June, because we will not need the \$300,000 to create the new computer program and the new computer form that would have been used in every facility. What we are doing now, is using the old cards...and with this plan...Representative Giglio is absolutely right, all it requires is the postage for sending these back. This is a very minor amount of money, approximately \$36,000. I just want to add also that...despite what my opponents on the other side of the aisle say, it is our business, it is our business to serve in this way, to make registration to vote as available and accessible as possible. I can only tell you that most of the people who watch television, who listen to radio, only become interested in the election about three weeks before the actual date of the election. they are permitted to register in this way throughout the year, we will not have that number of frustrated people who wish they could, in fact, have participated on November This is important, important legislation for 3rd. constituents. I urge you to vote 'aye' on the override."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3563 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Wennlund, one minute to explain your vote."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr...Thank you, Mr...Thank you, Mr.

 Speaker. In the event this receives the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Giorgi votes 'aye'. Giorgi votes 'aye'. Did you want to change your vote, Mr. Giorgi?

 Voting 'present', huh? Do you want to change your vote?

- 171st Legislative Day

 Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Stern asks to poll those not voting."
- Clerk McLennand: "Poll of those not voting. Representative LeFlore and McGann."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative LeFlore would like to vote 'aye'.

 LeFlore votes 'aye'. Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Just an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I thought you had...taken the record on this."
- Speaker McPike: "I have. I have. I did take the record, but as you know, you can change your vote any time until the Chair says it's either passed or declared lost."
- Black: "Oh you...you didn't make that final announcement."
- Speaker McPike: "No, I didn't make that."
- Black: "All right, all right."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, Representative Bugielski would like to change from 'present' to 'aye'. On this Motion, there are 71, on 71 'ayes' and 42 'noes' and Representative Wennlund has asked for verification of the 'aye' votes.

 Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the affirmative. Representative Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Deuchler. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. J. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Kirkland. Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund. Mr. Wennlund.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Clerk McLennand: "Laurino. LeFlore. Lomanto. Maloney.

Marinaro. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McAfee.

McDonough. McGuire. McNamara."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund. Larry, Don Saltsman would like to be verified. Don Saltsman. Thank you.

Proceed."

Clerk McLennand: "McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Novak. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Smith. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Walsh. White. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Laurino?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino? Billy Laurino? Is the Gentleman here? Representative Laurino? All right the...Mr. Laurino is not here, remove him from the Roll Call."

Wennlund: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker McPike: "Flinn is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Phelan?"

Speaker McPike: "Phelan's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kulas is voting 'present'."

Wennlund: "He's what? I'm sorry, I didn't hear."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kulas is voting 'present'."

Wennlund: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig? Representative Hannig. Gary Hannig. Is Mr. Hannig in the chamber? Mr. Hannig is not in the chamber, remove him from the Roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Balanoff?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Balanoff? All right, Balanoff is here. Mr.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Laurino has returned. Return Mr. Laurino as an 'aye' vote.
All right, proceed to Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "Who?"

Wennlund: "DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "DeLeo is here. He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hicks...is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Jesse White?"

Speaker McPike: "Is here. He's here. Mr. John Dunn would like leave verified. All right, go ahead. Go on and proceed then."

Wennlund: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here. Representative Wyvetter Younge would like to be verified. She's in the center aisle. All right, Ms. Younge, go ahead."

Wennlund: "Representative Woolard?"

Speaker McPike: "Woolard? Larry Woolard...is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker McPike: "Williams? Representative...we don't have a ...we don't have a Representative Williams. A Representative...is there a Representative Williams here?"

Wennlund: "No, he's not here anyway."

Speaker McPike: "You're right. Remove Representative Williams from the chamber. There's a...there he is up...he's up in the balcony. I...I see him, he's in the balcony."

Wennlund: "Representative Smith?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Smith? Where is Mr. Smith?'
Representative Smith. All right, Representative Smith. Is
the Gentleman here? He's not here, remove him from
the...Roll Call. Representative McGann would like to vote
'aye'. Mr. McGann votes 'aye'."

171st Legislative Day November 18, 1992

Wennlund: "Representative Santiago?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Deuchler?"

Deuchler: "I'd like to change my vote to 'no', please."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Deuchler would like to vote 'no'

on this. Change her from 'aye' to 'no'."

Wennlund: "Representative Santiago?"

Speaker McPike: "Santiago is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Saltsman?"

Speaker McPike: "Saltsman was...verified."

Wennlund: "...I'm...I'm sorry. Representative Trotter?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Trotter? Representative Trotter? Where is

Mr. Trotter? Representative Trotter...is he here? Mr.

Trotter is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll."

Wennlund: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Okay. Representative Capparelli. All right,
does anyone...is anyone seeking recognition?
Representative Ryder is seeking recognition. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, we're ready to take the Roll and you're...you, the Speaker, are being dilatory. I..I thought I'd bring that to your attention. Could we move?"

McPike: "All right, on this Motion Speaker there are...Representative Giorgi would like to change his vote from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Giorgi. Mr. Clerk, change Representative Giorgi from 'present' to 'aye'. this Motion...on this Motion there are 69 'ayes' and 43 'noes' and this Motion having...having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths...I'm sorry, Representative Smith has returned to the chamber. Mr. Smith has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Smith to the Roll Call as an 'aye' vote. Smith votes 'aye'. Thank you. All right, all right, Mr. Smith you're recorded as 'aye'. You can turn Mr. Smith's light off, he's recorded as 'aye'. Is anyone

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

else seeking recognition? Mr. Ryder, were you seeking recognition again? Oh, alright. Mr...On this Motion, there are...on House Bill 3563 on the Motion to override on House Bill 3563 on...Representative Stern's Motion override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 3563, there are...Representative Cullerton...he's here. Cullerton, votes 'aye'. On this Motion there are 70 'ayes' and 43 This Motion having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, is hereby declared...just Representative Hoffman. House Bill 3039. minute...lost. Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman here? Out of the record. House Bill 3092, Representative Currie. Representative Currie. House Bill 3201, Representative Wyvetter Representative Younge..."

Younge: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker McPike: "Well, we're gonna have...we have very good attendance if you'd like to call it now."

Younge: "Thank you so much, but I'd...I'd like it taken out of the record."

Speaker McPike: "All right, out of the record. Representative Woolard. Larry Woolard. Mr. Woolard...on House Bill 3221."

Woolard: "We're seeking to override the Governor's Veto on this particular piece of legislation which would allow prevailing wage to be a part of the tax increment financing projects and also the enterprise zone laws and also would...instill a penalty of \$5,000 on any person who was trying to coerce those people to return those dollars. I would encourage a favorable vote on this Veto Override."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Gentleman's Motion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield?"

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, I..I voted for this Bill last spring but subsequent things have happened that I want to get...I want to make sure I'm clear on with you. Is in fact, the intent of this Bill, to impose mandates on local units of government who have established TIF or enterprise zones?"

Woolard: "Very definitely that is the direction we are heading."

Black: "And...and I understand the original intent.

Would...would you...would you partially agree with me that since we voted on this last spring that the public has made it very clear they don't want anymore mandates imposed on their local units of government? That's it's not going to cost them a nickel or a penny or a dime?"

Woolard: "I don't think that we would be going back and retroactively causing any additional dollars on those existing facilities that are under construction or involved in projects at this time. We would only be dealing with those in future instances and I think that...they would be aware of the law change if we're successful today."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. I find it very difficult for me to stand in opposition to your Motion, when I, in fact, supported your Motion last spring. I would simply say to Members on my side of the aisle and those on your side of the aisle who care to listen, I think the public has, in fact, spoken very clearly about mandates emanating from Springfield that may cost them money. well intended, could take a Bill, matter how no construction project in an enterprise zone or a district assuming we even continue to fund TIF districts and could make it more expensive. And it could make it more expensive to the local taxpayer or the local unit of government which could very well mean as I understand what

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

they were trying to tell us on November 3rd. They don't want that additional expense. They want us to leave them alone, and so the only reason I stand in opposition to your Motion, well actually a persuasive argument from the Governor notwithstanding, but the primary reason is that I think a clear message was delivered to us on November 3rd that has changed somewhat the picture of this Bill. agree with you. It certainly doesn't make it a...anything retroactive or retrospective, but I think in light what...in my district I think was a 88% affirmative vote for that Mandates Act...while it was advisory in nature. I...I must change my vote and vote 'no'. I think the electorate has given us a...a clear direction as to what they want us to do, and no matter how well intention your Bill, it could very well add to the cost of government or even...even worse could prevent a government from perhaps entering into an agreement that would enhance their local economy through being able to...put...put up a project in a TIF or enterprise zone. And so, it's for that reason and that reason alone that I will change my vote on this and vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Woolard to close."

Woolard: "I think that probably the real underlying part of the legislation that we're talking about here, is the actual creation of opportunities of jobs in our state. Many of us who live close to surrounding areas that have a right to work legislation, etc., and have contractors who are competing with the local contractors within the state itself have a disadvant...our contractors have a disadvantage of working within the system and hiring those people who are able to accomplish those goals...of meeting the prevailing wage laws and hiring those union employees

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

in the the State of Illinois. The unfair competitive edge that someone from Kentucky, Indiana, wherever it might be, Missouri or Iowa coming in and taking the work away from our employees is my main concern. This is only consistency with existing laws on public works projects that we have in other entities now. We're adding the enterprise and TIF legislation areas to the same public works projects that are in place today. I would encourage a...override of this Veto."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3221 pass, Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 72 'ayes' and 39 'noes' and this Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, is adopted and this Bill is hereby declared passed the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Mr. Ryder."
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly glad to observe that your speech impediment is now gone and you can now read those words in a quick fashion. I hope..."
- Speaker McPike: "I had...I had lost this card. I found it. I lost this card."
- Ryder: "Well, the card that you just read was not the card that we were wanting you to read a few moments ago."
- Speaker McPike: "No, I had lost it, but..."
- Ryder: "...But in any event, I'm glad that you're now able to read it quickly and I'm certain that that'll be the standard of approval for the rest of the day."
- Speaker McPike: "Perhaps, Dr. Deets could give me some medicine."
- Ryder: "No, I... I don't think a physician would prescribe without

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

a thorough examination."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 2954, Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's Total Veto of House Bill 2954. This Bill...would have required the State Department of Revenue to collect the use tax on large ticket items such as boats, cars and airplanes, for the County of Cook. It relates specifically to...this 3/4 of 1% tax that has been unable to be collected when people go to the collar counties and elsewhere to purchase these items to save that 3/4 of 1% tax. The Governor in an effort to...apparently make sure that Cook County cannot collect this tax...vetoed the Bill. For those that are concerned about the cost, and I know many on the other side of the aisle are, let me point out very clearly that the Bill required a administrative fee to be paid to the State of Under the estimates for next year, that 2% would have amounted to \$400.000 easily enough to pay for administration costs of this, and I would ask...for all green votes to override the Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill and I support the Governor's Veto and would oppose the Override Motion. I...would oppose it on both procedural Procedurally this is a tax which philosophical...grounds. So in other words...the is not a point of sale tax. Department of Revenue...this is not simply auditing a...a cash register or receipts. The Department of Revenue has to follow people who pay this tax throughout the state and try to track them down. That's why this tax...costs so much money...to administer and it will cost a lot of money

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

to administer for the Department of Revenue. This is also home rule tax. Now...when we did the...the home rule...or the sales tax reform in 1990, we agreed that home rule use taxes would be the responsibility of home units to collect and now we're coming back and we're saying we're going to change that philosophy again. make sense, because once we open the door for one home rule unit we're going to open the door for a lot of other home rule units. Now on the philosophical side, the bottom line is, that this is a tax, a Cook County tax. This is a tax on people who come into Cook County and buy a large item. This is... President Phelan's tax, he proposed it, he passed it, but now he wants the state to collect it. He wants us to collect it. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is kind of a reverse mandate, so instead of a state saying you got do something, the county says we're...we're going this tax but propose you the state must collect it and violate the agreement of the sales tax reform which occurred in 1990. This is a tax on Cook County residents and you know, I've heard some of the proponents say, 'Oh, were not voting for the tax, we're voting to collect the Well, you know, that's kind of like, I didn't put the bullet in the gun, I didn't aim it at the victim, I merely pulled the trigger, so for me....when you vote for this override, when you vote for this override, you're voting for a tax, and a large one I might add, we're not talking about 10 bucks or 20 bucks, we're talking hundreds of dollars. Now the car dealers say, 'We're stuck between two entities, Mr. Phelan and Governor Edgar.' Well, I submit to you, the Legislature ought to stand up and say, 'If you want the tax Cook County, you passed created it, you collect it.' And I'll tell you what, you

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

know what's going to happen? If we say no to this Override Motion, they're going to repeal the tax. Now of course President Phelan is going to say, 'Oh my God, we're going to have to raise property taxes.' Is there anybody in this chamber that doesn't believe that Cook County couldn't, maybe pull a notch up on their belt and trim down the bureaucracy. Cook County Hospital has more doctors and nurses than they do patients. We have seen...Mr. Phelan's staff increase by an incredible amounts, so here we are paying for more government, more politics as usual in Cook County. So let's send a message to them. The people of this state said, 'We don't want to increase taxes, we want to hold the line on taxes', and my friend, when you vote to override on this Motion, you're voting to increase taxes, so please oppose this Motion. Let's send a message back to Cook County that they ought to repeal this tax and figure out how to cut their budget rather than keep hitting taxpayers for more, and more and more. Oppose the Override Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Member of the House. I'm amazed to hear a Representative from the County of opposing this Motion. There are many car dealers in the County of Cook who are going to find themselves totally disadvantaged if we do not override Governor...the...the Governor's Veto of this Bill and permit the State, Department of Revenue, to collect this sales tax. I were from DuPage County, I might oppose Ιf this Motion because this Motion...this this Bill will be...will make...make it fair, make competition equal between car dealers in Cook and DuPage County. If I were from DuPage County, I might be chomping up my sleeve at the

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

way the Governor's decision not to collect this tax will help me become more competitive in my effort to sell cars. But failing to override this Veto spells death to car dealers in Cook County who will no longer be economically competitive with other dealers in the five metropolitan area and it seems to me that this is not a partisan issue but it is certainly one that should matter within Cook County. Everybody from Cook County should surely be voting 'yes' and people from downstate areas should not be at all concerned to help us with this vote since it'll be no skin off their nose, no money out of the Treasury given the 2% collection fee the Department of Revenue is authorized to collect under this Bill. seem to me that those of you who are in favor of making sure that the car dealers in DuPage, Kane and Lake make out like one-arm bandits at the expense of businesses County, those of you who want that to happen had ought to be voting 'no', but those of you who think that we ought to make for fair competition in the private sector, the only sensible vote is a 'yes' one."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker said how can anyone from Cook County stand up and oppose this tax. My friends, I am from Cook County also and I am standing up just as...just as the lead speaker here earlier did. I am from Cook County and I am opposing the Override Motion. Am I unsympathetic to the plight of the car dealers in Cook County? Absolutely not. They are at a competitive disadvantage with the car dealers who are right across the line in DuPage and Kane and Will counties. Did we put them at that disadvantage? No. Did the Chairman of the County Board of Cook put them at that

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

disadvantage? Yes. Is there a fight with us? No. there a fight with them? Yes. Let's look at a little bit of history here. Several years ago, two, three years ago I believe, this General Assembly engaged in a great debate over the reform of our sales tax laws. We had a hodgepodge of sales tax rates, a hodgepodge of...of items that were included in the sales tax base throughout the State of Illinois. And for years, distinguished Members of this Legislature, such as the now, Comptroller of the State of Illinois, then Senator Dawn Clark Netsch, said, 'Wait a minute, we've got to change this system. We've got to reform our sales tax base because no one can understand And we spent years, we spent years doing that. Our objective in reforming the sales tax was twofold. wanted a common rate throughout the State of Illinois and we wanted a common base, in other words, a common base of on which the sales tax was going to be levied. During those negotiations, there was two contentious issues in terms of what was going to be in the sales tax base. One, was food and drugs. There were certain home rule communities such as Quincy, such as Mt. Vernon, who said We absolutely have to maintain our power to...to levy no. home rules taxes on food and drugs. That was a point We worked it out, and we worked it out by contingent. saying, 'You give up your power to levy a home rule tax on food and drug, we the State of Illinois will levy a 1% tax on food and drug throughout the state and we will remit the entire amount to communities throughout the State of Illinois.' The state does not get anything from the tax on food and drug. We solved the food and drug problem. other contentious issue in reform was cars, was vehicles, and the car dealers came to us and said, 'Wait a minute, we

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

do not want cars in that common base,' and we worked out an agreement. We said, 'Okay, we're going to keep cars out that common base if home rule communities want to levy the tax on cars, they can do it themselves, but it is their responsibility to collect the tax.' Now, there are four communities, four home rule communities in the State of Illinois that levy the tax on automobiles and on vehicles. Chicago, Springfield, Bloomington and there's one other one, I forget what it is. How do they collect the tax? When a vehicle is titled, the Secretary of State sends a list of those title registrations to the corporate officials in that municipality and say...saying, 'Here, it's your responsibility to collect the tax.' And what do those home rule communities do? They send out letters to the people who have titled those vehicles and you know what, 90 to 95% compliance rate. They collect the tax themselves. Now I will admit, Chicago is an exemption. That was an agreement which they struck with us, that for a two year period of time, we would collect, we the State of Illinois and the Department of Revenue would collect their sales tax on vehicles. That two year period of time is due to expire fairly soon. The procedure my friends for doing this, as I just explained, is a manual procedure. had to do it for the County of Cook, there would be a significant expense involved. If we did it for the County of Cook, imagine what would happen with those other 98 home rule municipalities that don't collect the tax now. would all say, 'Hey, the state's going to do it, we're going to levy the tax.' My own municipality of Arlington Heights increased their tax, just to levy the home rule just this past year, but they specifically excluded vehicles. So, the point here is this, we reformed our

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

sales tax two years ago, we knew what the rules of the game were at that time, we excluded automobiles, the President of the County of Cook said, 'The heck with that, I want to levy the tax and I want the state to collect it.' In other words, he's changing the rules after the agreement was made. Is it unfair perhaps to the car dealers? Certainly it is. It puts them...at somewhat of a competitive disadvantage, but their fight is not here, their fight is not on this Motion to override. The Governor made sense in terms of this Veto, the Total Veto of this Bill, his Veto should be upheld, and I urge a 'no' vote on the Motion to override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an easy vote for a downstater who is careful about voting on Bills for Cook adversely County or Chicago that might affect constituents. This Bill has absolutely no affect on my constituents at all. It's something that would help Cook County, implement the design of the Cook County Board to shift taxpayer responsibility from the property tax to a sales tax. There is adequate compensation to the state, 2% collected go to the state for of all the taxes the...purpose of helping collect this tax. That is estimated to be at least \$400.000 a year, and I have never heard anywhere along the way that...that is inadequate, fact, it's exactly the deal that Governor Edgar struck with Mayor Daley last year when the state agreed to collect the City of Chicago's sales tax. So, it's clearly an adequate amount, if it's not, let them come in and ask for more, but the computer programs are already there. The State of Illinois already collects local sales tax for a thousand different taxing units. It's very...it's...it would be

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

incomprehensible to push this burden off on to the County of Cook in an inefficient system that would cost them at least 3 or 4 times as much to go out and collect. Then, I would submit to you, they maybe coming to us for help in terms of...getting additional state revenue. Their to address a local situation with local problems and we ought to get away from this fool concept that...that every man for himself, every government for themselves, that the state is set up to collect this tax efficiently, we ought to provide that service to the people of Cook County. new car dealers of this state are strongly in favor of this Override Motion. The counties outside of the collar counties are totally unaffected, so that if a Cook County resident comes to Peoria, Illinois that I represent, buys a car, there's no use tax consequence whatsoever. So, it's clearly a good vote for downstate the...the reasons that the Governor has given I think are invalid. We ought to support Cook County in this initiative. I urge the downstaters support this Bill...this override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr Speaker, may we have some Lang: quiet in the chamber? Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Firstly, let that...for...for other people on the other side of the aisle who are always talking about the..the free market place...to be against a Bill that would provide, the dismantling of what's now a competitive disadvantage, makes sense to me at all. Relative to the Governor's Veto...let me point out that...Crane's and the Chicago Tribune have both been against the Governor's position on this. The Chicago Tribune took the time to editorialize against the Governor's position twice, and for those of you

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

who read the paper on a daily basis they did so today. It says, 'Veto Edgar's Use Tax Veto.' And the first words, and this is a quote and the quote is, 'Sales and Use Tax Collection should rest solely with the Illinois Department These words were written not by me, not by of Revenue.' anybody else, except they were written by Doug Whitley. Doug Whitley, the Governor's Director of Revenue who in 1987 was the Chairman of a Blue Ribbon Commission to study the collection of taxes. He was right then, and if he had stuck to his guns he'd be right today, but his change of heart leads us to believe that the Governor's position on this Bill, the Governor's position smacks of the rankest The Governor's position is a kind of amateur politics. position that says, 'Cook County wants this, the President the Cook County Board who may be one of my rivals at sometime in the future wants this, so we must therefore, be against this.' This Bill, if we override the Governor's Veto, will provide \$20,000,000 at least in property tax relief for citizens of Cook County next year at no cost to downstate Illinois. At no cost to anyone. It will provide a better balance so car dealers in Cook...in suburban Cook County can get some of the business back that they've lost other counties because of this...of this tax. And I remind you that this is not a new tax. This is a tax that on the books. The state will lose no dollars if the state collects this, just as the state has lost no dollars collecting it for the City of Chicago, and as I remind you just as the state has lost no dollars collecting the DuPage County gas tax. The Department of Revenue collects the DuPage County gas tax now. Nobody talked about how that was such a bureaucratic burden for the state then, nobody talked about the bureaucratic burden for the state when the

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

state decided to collect this for the City of Chicago. It's only when Cook County in Illinois wants to do this, to provide property tax relief for their citizens to provide business opportunities for the car dealers in Cook County, it's only then that the Governor in an effort to do some more Cook County bashing and some more bashing of the President of the Cook County Board, it's only then that the Governor of this state resorts to political tactics, vetoing good legislation so that he can make a political statement. I tell you that that's wrong and I tell you that those particularly in suburban Cook County on the other side of the aisle that vote against this Override Motion will have made a serious mistake in their constituency's. People want a competitive balance in business, they want this tax collected so that they can get property tax relief. This will cost none of you anything, it will cost the Governor a certain amount of embarrassment either way, because the Governor's trick in this case has not gotten past the people in my district, and not past the car dealers who have contacted me, and not past the people who pay taxes in my district that know, because of his veto that he has no interest whatsoever in property tax relief in my area and apparently not anywhere in Cook County. Please vote to override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund. Mr. Wennlund, the Chair has located Representative Williams, he's in the balcony up there. He's right up there. Representative Williams, Representative Wennlund was looking for you. There he is up there. Yes, there he is. That's... All right, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2954 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Black, to explain his vote."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You downstaters on either side of the aisle, now listen very carefully. Let's put all the baloney Let's get down to real politics. The DuPage gas tax is a point of sale collection, easily audited, to the point of sale, you collect the tax. This use tax on where you buy an automobile, the departments going to have to go after the individual. So, if you have an what individual who lives in Effingham, Mt. Vernon, Kankakee, Eldorado and he buys a camping trailer in Cook County and he comes back down to Mt. Vernon. The tax collector goes after him to get that tax. Who's he going to get mad at? he going to get mad at Dick Phelan and the Cook County Board when he has to cough up some other tax? No. He's going to get mad at his or her State Legislator because the Department of Revenue says, 'Give us some money partner. You owe it because you bought the car.' What are you going to do when your downstate automobile dealer gets in trouble because somebody lied on a registration form. This isn't a If you want an inspector in your point of sale tax. district to get a constituent mad at you, then you vote for this tax, because you'll take the heat for somebody downstate who buys a vehicle in Cook County, not Cook County, and they're going to take that frustration out on you, not the Cook County Board. Ah...no skin off a downstaters nose, hey, then why don't we just collect the Chicago parking tickets that all of us have 30 a month we deal with. What's the difference. You'd better be careful of this vote downstaters. This one will take some skin off your nose and maybe some skin off something else."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Homer: "I...I spoke in debate but...the Gentleman who just finished speaking...directly contradicted a statement that I made and I wish to reaffirm, that he withdraw...his assertion. This Bill applies only to the five collar counties around Cook. Only, to those five collar counties. I defy the Gentleman to repute my statement and to show anyone here that this Bill would extend to anyone downstate beyond the five collar counties."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik, one minute to explain your vote."

Kubik: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I all ready spoke in debate obviously,
but since...."

Speaker McPike: "Well then, for what reason to you rise?"

Kubik: "Well, on a point of personal privilege as long as
 Representative Homer..."

Speaker McPike: "Fine. State your point."

Kubik: "Okay, my point is that Representative, this is not a point of sale tax, so if somebody from Cairo buys a car or truck in Cook County, they pay the tax. They certainly do. This is not limited to people in Cook County, it's a tax on those people who buy items in Cook County, so if you're from Springfield, from Cairo, from Effingham or that wonderful list that Representative Black read, you will pay this tax. Your people are going to pay this tax if they decide to come up to this great area called Cook County and buy a automobile. So the fact of the matter is, the tax collector will follow you to Cairo, to Effingham, to Peoria wherever you might be."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund, one minute to explain your vote."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the five collar counties,

it's your car dealers, any of you who represent collar

counties, it's your car dealers whom the Department of

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Revenue is going after to collect this sales tax for the County of Cook. This is only going to start the chain reaction of home rule communities in Illinois, they're going to demand the same thing, and we're going to have the Department of Revenue collecting every possible tax for every home rule unit in Illinois. A massive cost factor for the Department of Revenue and for the taxpayer's of Illinois. Illinois didn't impose this tax, it was Dick Phelan who imposed this tax and he ought to collect his own tax. You shouldn't depend on the taxpayer's of Illinois to do it for him. Mr. Speaker, I request a verification in the event this receives the requisite number of votes."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. All right, on this Motion, there are 72 'ayes' and 45 'noes' and who asked for a verification?.

Mr. Wennlund did. Representative Wennlund asked for a verification. Representative Homer. Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Leave, please."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, yes."

Homer: "Leave for verify."

Speaker McPike: "Oh yes, Mr. Homer ask for leave to be verified.

And Representative Currie, Representative Currie would like to have leave. All right, and...just a minute, I got a few others. Representative Wennlund, could you write these names down? Representative Ellis Levin, in addition to...who did we start with? Okay, that's Homer, Currie, Levin, Shaw, Turner, Burke, Morrow and Capparelli. Did you get those Larry? All right. Mr. Clerk, proceed with the...poll of the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Barnes. Brunsvold. Bugielski.
Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering.

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn.

Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke.

Hicks. J. Hoffman. Homer. Lou Jones. Kulas. Lang.

Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Lomanto. Maloney. Marinaro.

Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McAfee. McDonough.

McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey.

Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice.

Richmond. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite.

Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Smith. Steczo. Stepan.

Stern. Trotter. Turner. Walsh. White. Wolf. Woolard.

Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "All right, Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lomanto?"

Speaker McPike: "Lomanto, is here."

Wennlund: "Could he wave so that..."

Speaker McPike: "All right, he's right there, he's right here.

You see him?"

Wennlund: "Wave at us."

Speaker McPike: "In the back."

Wennlund: "All right, how about Representative Maloney?"

Speaker McPike: "He's right there also."

Wennlund: "Can he wave at us too?"

Speaker McPike: "Yeah, he just did."

Wennlund: "Okay. Representative Smith? He wave?"

Speaker McPike: "Yeah, he's...he's there too."

Wennlund: "Thank you. I just wanted all the Members to know who

the new Members are."

Speaker McPike: "Yeah."

Wennlund: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker McPike: "Mulcahey. He was just here. Where....Mulcahey?

Representative Mulcahey. Dick Mulcahey. ... He was here

a...a few minutes ago."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Wennlund: "I didn't see him, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yeah. Mr. Mulcahey. The Gentleman is not here.

Remove him from the Roll."

Wennlund: "Representative Flinn? Monroe Flinn."

Speaker McPike: "You...want Lee to be verified? Yes. Mr.

Hartke, could we add him to our list? Chuck Hartke. All

right, Mr. Hartke, your clear. Mr. Flinn. Monroe Flinn.

Representative Flinn. All right, the Gentleman...Mr. Flinn
is not here. Remove him from the Roll."

Wennlund: "Representative McAfee?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McAfee is here. Ah...there's Mr. Flinn...just returned. Mr. Wennlund, Mr. Flinn is up front. So return Mr. Flinn as an 'aye' vote Mr. Clerk. All right, proceed."

Wennlund: "Representative Saltsman?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Flowers?"

Speaker McPike: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Wennlund: "Representative Flowers?"

Speaker McPike: "Ms. Flower's is...she's...she'll be righ...there she is. There she is."

Wennlund: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker McPike: "Richmond. He's right here. He's with Monroe."

Wennlund: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig is here. He came back."

Wennlund: "Representative Barnes?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jane Barnes. Representative Barnes in the chamber? Where is Representative Barnes? Representative Barnes is not here, remove her from the roll."

171st Legislative Day November 18, 1992

Wennlund: "Representative John Dunn?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

Wennlund: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "Pardon?"

Wennlund: "Nothing further. Please, take the record."

Speaker McPike: "All right. You were not verified. Alright.

Any...any further...no, there's no further requests from Mr. Wennlund. All right, on this Motion, there are 70 'ayes'. Representative Shirley Jones changes from 'no' to 'aye'. On this Motion, there are 71 'ayes and 44 'noes'.

This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, is adopted and House Bill 2954 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Curran, 3587. Mr. Curran you're...you're on."

Curran: "I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 3587. What this Bill does, is that it requires the state pay to it's bills on time. For too long, this state has been allowed to be a deadbeat when it comes to paying certain of it's bills and especially those going to our medical practitioners. So what this legislation does, is it require the state to pay interest on the money that owed on those...on those bills that are overdue. When the Governor vetoed this Bill, it is my opinion that he broke faith with those creditors that the state has, especially medical practitioners, dentists, etc. who have...who've really been letting the state ride for a long time on the money that is owed these people. This makes it a very difficult situation for state employees as well as those medical practitioners. In my community, we've had pharmacies that gone out of work, we've...we've had doctors, dentists, podiatrists and etc. who will not deal

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

with state employees, who'll make state employees pay up front because they do not get paid on time. This Bill is a matter of fairness, we passed it overwhelmingly last summer and I believe that we should now override the Governor's Veto. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino in the Chair."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise in opposition of Gentleman's Motion. If indeed the issue is fairness, then why don't we include all vendors in a Bill. Why don't we include those people who've done business with the state in good faith, they're not covered under this Bill. They have to ask in writing, but medical providers, while they certainly provide a...a vital and needed service, they get this late payment...interest payment automatically. other vendor in the state, will have to ask for it. I would submit to you, that I don't have any underlying philosophical problems with the Gentleman's Motion or Bill, but this is...this Bill is based on inherent fairness and equity. It singles out and makes special one group of providers to those citizens that we represent. suggest that you want to vote 'no' or 'present' on Bill and vote for a compromise Bill, Senate Bill 1588, which passed the Senate, has already passed the Senate, to 1, so it will come over to this House and it will address those interest payments to all vendors. that's equity, it's already passed the Senate, this Bill singles out some vendors and says they get all automatic interest payments. I don't think that that's what we want to do, we do have a reasonable and viable compromise in Senate Bill 1588 which has already passed the

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Senate 56 to 1, I'm sure it will pass the House by a similar margin. That Bill deals with fairness and equity, this Bill creates a super category of providers that get interest payments automatically, and I don't think that's what we really want to do, so I think a 'no' vote could be justified. If you can't vote 'no', I think a 'present' vote could certainly be justified and I would so ask."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "To close, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Proceed."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would've appreciated and accepted the Gentleman's arguments from the other side of the aisle had he made any attempt upon Second Reading to change this Bill to the way he says he now prefers it. But actually at that time he was silent, on Third Reading. He was silent and so what we have now is a stronger and better Bill than than Senate Bill 1588. A Bill that is tougher, a Bill that is therefore fairer to these practitioners, more likely to be paid on time and more likely to be good for state employees. I ask the Members of this chamber to be fair to state employees and to be fair to medical practitioners by requiring the state to drop its deadbeat status and start paying bills on time. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3587 pass the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 60...62 'aye', 34 'nay', 11 voting 'present', not having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, fails. House Bill 3592,

171st Legislative Day

Representative Edley. Out

- November 18, 1992
- Representative Edley. Out of the record. House Bill 3605, Representative Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 4112, Representative McNamara. Gentleman in the chambers? Out of the record. The Chair will proceed to Page 10 on the Calendar, Amendatory Veto Motions Gubernatorial Compliance. House Bill 2979, Representative...Sorry Mr. Clerk, it's House Bill 1352, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to accept the Governor's Veto of House Bill 1352...it removes some language that was intended to help a school district in my area but made moot because the referendum lost and was therefore extraneous to the legislation, so the Motions totally acceptable. I move approval."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,

 Representative Black."
- Black: "I...it just gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in support of a very fine piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Laurino: "It gives me a great deal of pleasure to allow you to have that great deal of pleasure. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1352?' All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Lang, 'aye'. This Bill having received 115 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 0 voting 'present', this Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change. House Bill 2979, Representative Woolard. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Woolard, proceed."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Woolard: "I would move to accept the Amendatory Veto on 2979."

Speaker Laurino: "Okay, Representative Woolard, your microphone is on."

Woolard: "I've already stated by case. I accept."

Speaker Laurino: "You want...I'm sorry I didn't...understand exactly everything you said. You must have been with Williams up in the gallery when you..."

Woolard: "Zeke taught me well."

- Speaker Laurino: "...explained this. The question is...'Shall accept the specific recommendation for change in respect to House Bill 2979?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed voting 'nay', the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Monique Davis, 'aye'. Representative Granberg, 'aye'. Have all...and Jesse White. Representative White, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received the 117 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present', this Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change. House Bill 3187, Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General

 Assembly. I accept the Governor's...Veto...for Veto

 Amendment for change."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendation for change in respect to House Bill 3187?' All those in favor indicate by voting say...voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 112 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

voting 'present', it has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 3555, Representative Maloney."

Maloney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a Motion to accept the Governor's Veto on House Bill 3555. This Bill had passed 114 to 0."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Who's the Sponsor of this Motion?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Maloney."

Black: "Maloney. Where is Representative Maloney?"

Speaker Laurino: "He's...he's in the back..."

Black: "He's in the back?"

Speaker Laurino: "Yes, he is."

Black: "All right, was this Motion filed in the...proper form in writing and of those things, he's suppose to do?"

Speaker Laurino: "We'll, we'll do a little double checking. I think Representative Williams helped him out."

Black: "Did Representative Williams help him out?"

Speaker Laurino: "I think he did."

Black: "Well I...I...we just...this is a new name to us...and while this Bill passed out of here in the spring with I believe a unanimous vote, it had a different Sponsor, and now the Sponsor has changed and the Sponsor...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Maloney, will you yield to the...the Gentleman's questions? He indicates he will, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Representative Maloney...what's the genesis of this Bill?"

Maloney: "This...this Bill repeals to...this repeals two sections

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

of the Board of Higher Education Act which are no longer needed, Sir."

Black: "Are there any known opponents to the Bill as...as the Governor has amendatory vetoed it?"

Maloney: "That's correct."

Black: "This affect...University of Illinois Chicago Campus at all?"

Maloney: "No, it does not."

Black: "Where's...where's Mr. Hinds on this Bill?"

Maloney: "He has no position on this...that I know of..."

Black: "There's no cost to this Bill whatsoever?"

Maloney: "No cost at all."

Black: "Then it's...it's your intent then. Your not changing the intent of Representative Keane's Bill in any way shape or form?"

Maloney: "That's correct, I am not."

Black: "All right, thank you very much, Mr. Representative. An inquiry of the Chair. I didn't get an answer to my earlier question. I just...if you would check to make sure that all of the forms are filed in the proper manner and that this has been done in accordance with House Rules, I...I may...I may vote 'yes', I'm not sure. I'm still not sure of the Gentleman's intent, so...I'd like to make certain that all the proper forms are signed, documented and the receipt stamped at the proper time so that the Gentleman's Motion is in order."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black, it appears that...Representative Maloney has done everything...and everything is copacetic at this moment."

Black: "So that eve...everything is in order. On file?."

Speaker Laurino: "It...it appears that way."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I....Ladies and

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

Gentlemen of the House. The hour grows late, I appreciate the...Gentleman's...patiences and he's answered the questions, but...there could be a change of intent in this Bill from when...from it's introduction by our esteemed and highly respected colleague, Representative Keane. And since I don't have time to analyze...any possible change of intent in this Bill from Representative Maloney, I...I suggest a 'no' vote might be in order."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative....Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "I have had all the time I need to...go over this thoroughly, but the Governor's Veto Message...indicates that he is...following the standard articulated by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois in people ex rel, Klinger versus Howlett...I'm not familiar with that case. What's...what's the...what's that case about? What precedent was established in that case?"

Maloney: "Would you repeat the question, please."

Dunn: "Well there...actually there are three...Supreme Court cases referred to in the Governor's Veto Message...people ex rel, Klinger versus Howlett, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company versus Zagle and people ex rel, City of Canton V Crouch and...I just wonder if we could have...a brief...description of....of the colonel of those decisions so we could...so we could have some notion about what we're doing on this Bill."

Maloney: "The analysis of the Veto Message that I have from...the staff does not contain any of that information, Sir."

Dunn: "Well...I...don't speak for the Staff but...we want to be thorough with this legislation. This is a long Bill

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

it's...it's 60 pages long and...the Governor has made a number of changes...on page...two changes on page 1, one on page 2, one on...three on page 59, two on page 60, three on page 60. I...I really don't...don't know without further scrutiny what...exactly what we're up to here and I think we ought to have a little more detailed explanation so maybe the Sponsor of the Motion could...could go over again...what he's up to here."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Cowlishaw."

Dunn: "Does this have anything to do with Casino gambling?"

Speaker Laurino: "Hold on a second, Representative Cowlishaw.

What's your question now, Representative Dunn?"

Maloney: "Yes, it is."

Dunn: "Well, the explanations have been somewhat incomplete.

I...You know, I'm a downstater and I...I'd like to know if
this Bill has anything to do at all with casino gambling,
that's one thing I'd like to know."

Maloney: "Not to my knowledge, Sir."

Dunn: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Cowlishaw, please."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps a brief explanation of what this Bill did and why the Governor did what he did would be helpful. Originally this Bill consisted basically only three portions. Two of which repeal requirements placed upon the Board of Higher Education previously and the third of which created something called Higher Education Student Assistance Act. legislation was also the creation of that Higher Education Student Assistance Act was also contained in it was the only element in House Bill 2166. In order to save confusion, the Governor signed into law, House Bill 2166

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

and then removed those provision from this Bill. So this Bill no longer creates anything. All it does is repeal a couple of provisions formerly enacted for the Board of Higher Education to conduct pilot programs or promulgate rules relating to the operation, tutorial programs in institutions of higher education. In other words, this Bill does so little that it is absolutely safe to accept the Amendatory Veto."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,

 Representative Maloney to close."
- Maloney: "I ask for favorable support on this...provision. Thank you."
- "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Speaker Laurino: specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 3555?' All those in vote....in favor will vote 'aye', The board is open. Have all voted who opposed 'nay'. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 112 'ayes', 2 voting 'nay'..'no', and This Motion having received the 1 voting 'present'. required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted Governor's specific and the House accepts the recommendations for change. The Chair proceeds to page 2 the Calendar, under House Bills Third Reading, House Bill 4216, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4216 is a Bill that addresses the downstate firefighter's pension fund. Amendment #1 that was adopted on Second Reading, deleted everything after the enacting clause and became the Bill. This Amendment contained two provisions; number one, which would allow parity to widow benefits of the downstate firemen's system on a parity with

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

that of the downstate policemen's pension system; secondly, the Amendment would allow the widow of a downstate fireman to remarry and not lose the pension benefits that were accrued. The remarrying provision under this Bill would not take effect until July the 1st, 1993. I would move for the passage of House Bill 4216."

Speaker Laurino: "Before we proceed, Mr. Clerk, will you read the Bill, please."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 4216, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill, not because I don't think that there are some good underlying reasons for supporting the Bill, there are some good provisions to the Bill, but I think the Membership should understand that the Municipal League, according to the memo that we have received, had not agreed to these benefit increases because they exceed the ability of the employers to finance these benefits. And I think we also ought to keep in mind, here are less than two weeks or less than 10 days after an election in which we overwhelmingly passed a advisory referendum on mandates, and here we are coming back and we're talking about mandating this to our local communities and providing these benefits and not providing the money to pay for these benefits. So, I would think that we'd take a very slow approach on this and we ought to take into consideration that this is an unfunded mandate and that the Municipal League has opposed this particular Bill because they have not agreed to it according to a memo that we've received on our side of the aisle. So, I would ask that you'd either vote against it or 'present' until we get some

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

kind of an agreement among all the parties and funding is in place for this measure."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've always tried to work on an Agreed Bill basis, and quite frankly, this Bill is moving too fast. there's still room for negotiation, but shoving this through right now, I don't think, is going to be conducive to negotiations. I think there should be some common ground that we can work on this, but as the Bill is written, it will cost well over, I believe it is ten million dollars, and protracted that means a lot of of your local villages and cities and towns are going to end up paying a big chunk of money for this. I know that one municipality has told me that they estimate this will cost Now, granted, they're fairly big them about \$600,000. town, but I have to tell you, I don't think that this is what you want to do. This is another unfunded mandate and we know that the citizens of this state spoke loud and clear on the referendum, that they do not want any more I think this is a mistake. I think unfunded mandates. there's still room to negotiate, and I would ask that both sides come together and find common ground. But, as this Bill is proposed right now, this is not good. I would ask my colleagues on both sides to vote 'no' on it and send them all back to the negotiating table and see if we can find some common ground, but this is not the way to do it."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the downstate legisla... I rise in support of this Bill, but I do want to make sure that all the downstate Members are aware of what we're voting on. So, this does not affect...the City of Chicago,

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

it affects downstate fire...downstate firefighters and their pensions, and Terry Parke is correct, this Bill costs \$14 million. It is approximately 6.5% of the payroll for the fire departments, a 6.5% increase. So whatever your local fire department's budget is, this will increase it by 6.5%. Fourteen million dollars downstate. It does not affect Chicago. I'm very sorry that the Agreed Bill process has not worked. I was involved with it last December, a year ago, and we were able to get an agreement on the IMRF downstate employees. We were unsuccessful in getting agreement with the downstate police and an unsuccessful in the downstate fire...firefighters. have to continue to negotiate throughout the year, but have simply been unable to come up with an agreement, and so the process itself, the Agreed Bill process, does not work unless both sides are willing to give. Both sides must come to the bargaining table in Springfield in good faith and try to negotiate a compromise. This has not. unfortunately, this simply has not happened, and so we have waited now for...with no changes, for five years. The last Agreed Bill, I think, for police and fire, was five years So that was a three-year ago. Is that correct? Yes. period where we had no legislation introduced because we had an agreement, and now two years have gone by and we still have no agreement. I don't anticipate there will be an agreement because the sides simply have not found a common meeting ground. Given the fact that it's been five years, some of us felt that well the process is working, so we're simply going to move ahead and let individual Legislators vote for it. I will reiterate one more time. This Bill cost \$14 million. It's an increase of 6.5%. I intend to vote for it. In my town, less than a

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

month ago, we had an unfortunate accident where two firefighters were killed in the line of duty. I wish this provision had been law a month ago and that we were not going to vote on it today. So, I intend to support it as I have always tried to support my local firefighters. Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Wolf to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In response Wolf: to the previous speaker, he's absolutely correct. The cost of this program is in the vicinity of \$13 to 14 million. Through an error in the original fiscal impact note that was filed, there was an error made in that, and as explained to all of our colleagues, you are surely to be aware that in this instance there is the possibility that a local property tax increase for certain units of local government might be necessitated in order to conform or to comply with this mandate. As far as the speaker on the other side of the aisle, I would agree with him. In every case we try to effect an Agreed Bill in any Pension Bill that we put out on this floor. In this particular instance we have run into one hurdle and one obstacle after another. These negotiations have been going on for the last four to five years. We are now at a point where we question sincerely whether or not one party or the other is really negotiating in full faith, and this is the basis for submitting this Bill and to support the provisions that are in it. I would ask your support of House Bill 4216."

Speaker Laurino: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 4216 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Representative Saltsman to explain his vote."

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those figures, again, have Saltsman: been said...have been proven, as the Economic and Fiscal Commission said, they are a million and half off again, even after this last report. But there's one thing I want The person that makes this actuarial let you know. study has made actuarial studies through the cities Department of Insurance, and our hiring...they're hiring other firms to come in and they are hiring these people to look at the liability and the They have proven, the cities have, that the same program. person that has come with this amount of unfunded liability has been anywhere from 40 to 60% off. Now the same person program for the Economic/Fiscal that's doing the the same guy that's doing it for the Commission, is So these are all assumptions. He can Municipal League. make it \$18 million and he can make it \$2 million, whoever screams at him the loudest and has got the most pull, that's the way these assumptions work. credibility of the Department of Insurance, and what they have been doing with all these pension systems, it's a wonder half of them aren't in court. In the City of Peoria it says you owe 2.3 million, they hire a private actuary, they say you only owe 1.1. So if he says it's \$14 million, figure it 60% off. Now this is what's happening all over. Go home and ask your people. Don't hold it back on account of this cause it's not a \$14 million program. There's 280 different systems in...private systems in the State of Illinois, and we don't have that many widows. These figures are definitely wrong. Vote for this legislation." Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. This Bill having received 66 'aye', 26 'no' and

171st Legislative Day

- November 18, 1992
- 'present', this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair will proceed to page 10, Amendatory Veto Motions Gubernatorial Compliance. House Bill 3598, Representative Manny Hoffman. Proceed, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's recommended changes, and all this would do would be to make some technical changes in regard to the legislation we now have."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3598...shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', Bill 3598?' opposed voting 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who who wish? wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 112 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', has received the required Constitutional Majority, Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 3674, Representative Capparelli. Proceed, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for a change in House Bill 3674. The Amendatory Veto of the Governor recommends that three words, 'continue, retain and maintain', be deleted on page 33, line 10, of the Bill. The language that it changed is agreed by all affected parties and I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 3674?' All those in

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill Bill 3843, Representative Curran."

- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill 3843. All his change does is move back the implementation date, effective date of this Bill, by six months. I think...frankly think it makes it a better Bill and I'd be glad to answer any questions and I move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 3843?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion having received 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', has received the required Constitutional Majority for...so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. For what reason does Representative Matijevich arise?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent and use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose, to suspend the rules...the posting rules and the rule whereby committee cannot meet while we're in Session, so that the Rules Committee can meet immediately in the Speaker's

- 171st Legislative Day

 conference room to hear Senate Bill 1988 on the exemption.

 This has been cleared with Representative Churchill, so I would ask unanimous consent."
- Speaker Laurino: "Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave and be so proceeded to. I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Marty (Guitella) to the House chambers. He's a renowned school teacher and vice-principal of Northshore School. I welcome Mr. (Guitella). He's seated at Senator-elect DeLeo's desk. Committee Reports."
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Committee on Rules has met on November 18th,
 1992. Pursuant to Rule 46.1, makes the following report on
 Amendatory Vetoes of the Governor. Under compliance with
 Rule 46.1(b) is Senate Bill 1988. Signed, John Matijevich,
 Chairman."
- Speaker Laurino: "House proceeds to page two on the Calendar.

 House Bill 3475, Representative Giglio. Read the Bill, Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3475, a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any Amendments or Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. Representative Giglio. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3475, a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Giglio."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that just says that the prevailing...(INAUDIBLE)"
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Hultgren."

171st Legislative Day November 18, 1992

Hultgren: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Hultgren: "(INAUDIBLE)"

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in...(INAUDIBLE)"

- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Wennlund, would you hold your remarks for one second, we're preparing a tape recorder? Essentially our sound system is malfunctioning right at the moment. House will stand at ease for a moment. Representative Wennlund, would you like to proceed with your remarks, Sir?"
- Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is puts all contractors on a parity. On an even playing field. This is good legislation. It's pro-business, it's also pro-labor. It puts everybody on a fair and even, level playing field, and I urge the adoption and I urge your support for this Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the...shall House Bill 3475 pass?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 76 'aye', 29 'no' and 1 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 11 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3519, Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto pertaining to House Bill 3519."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

for change with respect to House Bill 3519?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 116 'aye', 0 'nay', 0 'no'...'present', has received the required voting Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. It's the Chair's position that we'd like to start to wind down the Session for the evening, so we are going to put ourselves into the position of putting some of these Bills into the correct posture for tomorrow. There appears on the Speaker's Table a series of Motions that we are going to call, and hopefully we can go through these as quickly as possible and allow you to enjoy a good repast So we're going this evening. to call House Bill 178, Representative Matijevich. House Bill 178, pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table, suspend Rules 79(c) and (d) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Representative Matijevich. All in favor of this Motion indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. By the use of the Attendance Roll Call, this Bill is put on the Speaker's Table...take from the Speaker's Table. House Bill 714, Representative Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table, suspend Rules 79(c) and (d) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. All those in indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. 'Ayes' have it. Leave for the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted. Bill is taken from the Speaker's Table. House Bill 3188, Representative Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table, suspend Rules 79(c)...(e) and (d),

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

is it? (e) and (d), I sorry. My glasses don't...and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. the Attendance Roll Call? Leave being granted, Attendance Roll Call is recorded and the Bill is taken from the Table. House Bill 2104, Representative Speaker's Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from Matijevich. the table, suspend Rules 37(g) and place on Third Reading, Consideration Postponed. 2104. House Bill 2104. for the Attendance Roll Call. Leave being granted, Motion is placed on Third Reading, Consideration Postponed. Gentleman asks leave of the House to consider four Bills concerning the same subject matter: House Bill 4247, House Bill 4248, 4249 and 4250, Representative Matijevich. the House have leave? Attendance Roll Call. House has leave. Pursuant to...and they all concern the same rules. Pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on Personnel and Pensions from further consideration; pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table, suspend Rule 27(e) and 37(g), place on the Calendar, Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Matijevich, on House Bills 4247, 4248, 4249 and 4250. Move Leave being granted, the for the Attendance Roll Call. Attendance Roll Call has been used and the Bills will be Legislative Reading, Second placed on Second Representative Matijevich on Senate Bill 420. He asks leave of the House pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to from the table, suspend Rule 37(g) and place on the Calendar, Order of Third Reading. Does the Gentleman have Attendance Roll Call being utilized, the Motion is leave? to place the Bill on the Calendar, Order of Third Reading. So be it! Senate Bill 698. Representative Matijevich asks leave of the House. Attendance Roll Call to move. I move

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

to suspend Rules 79(d) and (e) and place on the Calendar, Order of Conference Committee Reports. Does he have leave? House indicates he does. The Motion carries and the Bill will be put on Conference Committee Reports...Calendar, Order of Conference Committee Reports. House Bill 741. Representative Hannig moves to... The Motion is, 'I move to suspend Rules 79(e), place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports.' The Gentleman asks leave of the Attendance Roll Call of the House. Representative Black. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know we're anxious to get out of here, but I will rise to object to these substantive Motions. I want to slow the process down. I can't understand what you're saying. We don't have half of these Bills in front of us. I want to know what the Gentleman's intention is on this Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black, do you have a specific question to ask of Representative Hannig? He'd be glad to answer your question, Sir."
- Black: "Thank you very much. Representative, what...I find nothing in our packets that would indicate what you intend to do with this piece of legislation. Would you enlighten me?"
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Representative. This is a Conference Committee Report that we would like to make the Motion, when it's appropriate, not to accept the First Conference Committee Report, then ask for the Second Conference Committee Report to be called. And this is at the request of Senator Rea, and he's indicated to me that he wants to put together something to do with a school district in his district that I don't anticipate it to be controversial."

Black: "And I appreciate that. I remember you talking to me

- 171st Legislative Day

 about that. The problem is, we don't have the Conference

 Committee Report in the file."
- Hannig: "We want to...Representative, we want to not accept the First Conference Committee Report and ask for a Second Conference Committee Report."
- Black: "Okay. All right. Alright, I'm sorry. Thank you, I appreciate that. We have no objection."
- Speaker Laurino: "Leave being granted from the House, Senate Bill 741, Representative Hannig, has been accepted, and the Attendance Roll Call be utilized to put this Bill on the Calendar under Conference Committee Reports. Senate Bill 779, Representative Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table and pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on State Government, suspend Rules 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Calendar, Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Gentleman leave of the House and wishes to utilize Attendance Roll Call. Does he have leave? Attendance Roll Call will be utilized and the Gentleman does have leave and be so reported. Senate Bill 1045, will Bill the Representative Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table and pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on Judiciary II, suspend Rules 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Calendar, Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. The Gentleman asks the leave of the House and wants...wishes to use the Attendance Does he have leave? The Gentleman...appears Roll Call. that he has leave to use the Attendance Roll Call and the Bill will be so reported. Senate Bill 1160, Representative Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 27(e), I move to discharge the Committee on Judiciary I, Interim Study Calendar, from further consideration, and suspend Rule 27(d) and (e) and

- 171st Legislative Day
 November 18, 1992
 37(g) and place on the Calendar, Order of Second Reading,
 Second Legislative Day. The Gentleman asks leave of the
 House to use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative
 Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair. Are there any Amendments on this Bill?"
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black, this Bill will be used for noncompliance and there are no Amendments."
- Black: "So there are no Amendments on the Bill? All right.

 Thank you. Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "No, Sir. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call on Senate Bill 1160, appearing...and the House does grant leave, and so the Bill will be so reported. Representative Black, Senate Bill 1424, Matijevich, will also be used for noncompliance Bills. Pursuant to Rule 27(e), I move to discharge the Committee on Judiciary II, Interim Study Calendar, from further consideration, and suspend Rules 27(d) and (e) and 37(g) and place on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1424, I would rise to object to the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1606,
 Representative Matijevich. I move to suspend Rule 79(d)
 and (e) and place on the Calendar, Order of Conference
 Committee Reports. Gentleman asks leave of the House to
 use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Black
 objects."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I object to the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record. Then on page 15, Senate Bill 2100, Matijevich. I move to suspend Rule 79(d) and

171st Legislative Day

November 18, 1992

- (e) and place on the Calendar, Order of Conference Committee Reports. Gentleman asks leave of the House and use of the Attendance Roll Call. Leave being granted, the Bill will be so reported. Senate Bill 1679, Matijevich. Pursuant to Rule 27(e), I move to discharge the Committee on Executive, Interim Study Calendar, from further consideration, suspend Rule 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call. Leave being granted, the Bill will be so reported. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of your Amendment of the Bill of the following title, to wit; Senate Bill 1635, Amendment #1, action taken by the Senate, November 18th, 1992. Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.'"

Speaker Laurino: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2574, offered by Representative Brunsvold; 2575, Ryder; 2576, Novak; 2577, Novak; 2578, Burzynski; 2579, Burzynski; 2580, Burzynski; 2581, Trotter and Balanoff; 2582, Pullen; 2583, Daniels, and House Joint Resolution 163, Richmond; House Joint Resolution 164, Cowlishaw, and House Resolution 2585, Currie."
- Speaker Laurino: "House now recognizes Representative Matijevich.

 He moves that the House stand adjourned and...moves that we adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2584, offered by Representative

- 171st Legislative Day

 Wyvetter Younge, a Bill...with respect to the memory of

 Mary Elizabeth Tibbs Brown."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolution. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Death Resolution is adopted. Introduction and First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction First Reading of Bills. House Bill
 4251, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to
 amend 'An Act making appropriations'. First Reading of the
 Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Matijevich moves that we adjourn this evening and convene at 10 a.m. tomorrow, November the 19th. 10 a.m. tomorrow, November the 19th."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The House will come into Special Session...the Second Special Session. The Attendance Roll Call from the Regular Session will be used for the Second Special Session. ...(INAUDIBLE)"

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

NOVEMBER 18. 1992

HB-0178	MOTION	PAGE	78
HB-0714	MOTION	PAGE	78
HB-1129	VETO ACTION	PAGE	5
H3-1352	MOTION	PAGE	62
Hu-2016	VETO ACTION	PAGE	13
H3-2104		PAGE	79
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	44
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	62
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	17
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	23
HB-3187		PAGE	63
H3183		PAGE	
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
Hd-3519		PAGE	77
H3555		PAGE	64
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	28
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	59
H3-3598		PAGE	74
HB-3674		PAGE	74
HL-3843		PAGE	75
HB-3979		PAGE	63
	THIRD READING	PAGE	68
H4247		PAGE	79
HB-4248		PAGE	79
H3-4249		PAGE	79
H 4250		PAGE	79
	FIRST READING	PAGE	34
SJ-0420		PAGE	79
SU-0698		PAGE	79
SB-0741		PAGE	80
0779 - د		PAGE	5 1
Su-1045		PAGE	31
\$5-1160		PAGE	31
S1424		PAGE	32
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	32
SB-1606		PAGE	82
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
SB-1679		PAGE	
\$2100		PAGE	
HR-0322		PAGE	5
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
-			
	SUBJECT MATTER		

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND RALPH DEMING	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	1
INTRODUCE MIKE MCGUCKIN GOLF CHAMPION	PAGE	13
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	60
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	76
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	83
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	83
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	83
HOUSE - ADJOURNED	PAGE	84
HOUSE COME TO ORDER - SECOND SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	84
SECOND SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNED	PAGE	34